dation, can be given the plot of 40 sq. yards in its places, if so, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) As per clarification issued by the Delhi Admn. in November, 1990, persons whose lands measuring exactly one bigha were acquired and in respect of which awards were announced prior to 3-4-1986 are eligible for 40 sq. yards plot.

(c) Prior to 15-11-1990, in some cases by a wrong interpretation of the orders, Delhi Administration had recommended 250 sq. yards erroneously in case of land acquired measured one bigha. The correct position was clarified on 15-11-1990. In respect of cases where 250 sq. yards plots were wrongly recommended no final decision has been taken by the Delhi Administration.

Rohini Residential Scheme

3422. SHRI SHIV PRASAD CHANPURIA: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of changes for location of plots were made from Rohini Residential Scheme to other fully developed schemes of North Zone during January, 1989 to June, 1992;

(b) what are the grounds for which changes were allowed;

(c) the number of allottees still requesting for change from Rohini Residential Scheme to other developed colonies of North Zone;

(d) the requests of such allottees of Rithala Village in Rohini were considered but not acceded to; and

(e) what are the reasons for not allowing change of requests affected Rithala Villagers to other developed Schemes of North Zone?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) DDA have reported that in 14 cases changes were allowed during the period January 1989 to June 1992 for reasons such as:

(i) Plot allotted was a irregular size.

(ii) Plot allotted is not fully developed.

(iii) Existance of grave yard etc. at the site.

(c) In 9 cases allottees, are still requesting for change from Rohini residential scheme to other developed pockets of North Zone.

(d) and (e) Two cases of requests for change of allottees residing in Rithala Village from Rohini to other pockets of North Zone were not agreed to earlier. However, their subsequent requests for change are again under examination.

Construction of road in Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi

3423. SHRI SHANTI TYAGI: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that huge amount was spent to construct a 100 feet wide road from the Railway crossing to the Railway Colony, Mandawali Fazalpur, Delhi but only a stretch of 500 yards was constructed;

(b) if so, what measures have been taken to complete the road, during the last five years;

(c) whether it is a fact that there is no link road to connect the Railway Colony to any motorable road in its vicinity;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the drains in the colony remain blocked with filth and dirty water and fear of outbreak of epidemic looms large at all times but the colony is declared an urbanised regularised colony; and

(e) if so, what steps have been taken to improve the sanitary conditions and for urbanisation of the colony, in order to mitigate the hardships of the residents?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) The Municipal Corporation of Delhi has reported that the existing portion of the 100 feet wide road has been constructed by the DDA. The remaining portion is to be constructed by the P.W.D. (Delhi Administration). This part of the road is falling in the alignment of the Master Plan Road for which survey is being conducted by the P.W.D. to examine the feasibility as per.

(c) The Municipal Corporation of Delhi has reported that it is connected through Roadway road to other motorable road in the area.

(d) and (e) It is reported that five Safai Karmacharies have been deployed for day-today-cleanliness of the colony. Desilting of out-fall Nallah has been done as a pre-monsoon drive. The Delhi Water Supply Sewage Disposal Undertaking has also reported that estimates have been prepared by them for providing internal sewers in this colony.

Encroachment of Public Place in Sangam Vihar, New Delhi

3424. Will the Minister of URBAN Development be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1750 given in Rajya Sabha on 2nd August, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that SDM of South District in his decision in case No. 14/SDM.91 on 13th January, 1992, had ordered the SHO Okhla Police Station to enquire into the whole ambit of the conspiracy to sell off the Government land in Sangam Vihar, New Delhi; and

(b) if so, what action Government have taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) Yes. Sir.

(b) Delhi Police reports that the enquiry report was submitted to SDM, South District.

Encroachment of Public Land in Shyam Vihar, New Delhi

3425. SHRI N. E. BALARAM: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1750 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 2nd August, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that S.D.M. of South District had sent a letter to D.C.P. South District vide No. F|SDM|SC|1440 dated 30th August, 1991 for registering a case against the erring persons and to stop the encroachment on the said Gaon Sabha Land;

(b) if so, whether the case has been registered against the erring persons; and

(c) if not, what are the persons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Does not arise in view of (b) above.

Allotment of shops to pavement vendors of Janpath Lane, New Delhi

3426. SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the news item which appeared in the 'Navbhara Times', New Delhi, dated the 14th July, 1992 regarding alleged irregu-